



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,538	12/09/2003	Peter V. Uribarri	2433-000001	4561

27572 7590 02/28/2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

BRUENJES, CHRISTOPHER P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,538	Applicant(s) URIBARRI, PETER V.	
	Examiner Christopher P. Bruenjes	Art Unit 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-24 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-24, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

1. The objections to the specification and claims 20-31 of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 2-3 Paragraphs 3-5, have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claims 2-3, 5, 8, 12, 14, 21-23, and 25-26 of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 4-5 Paragraph 6, have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 1-2 and 10 over Ford in view of Schnegg of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 6-7 Paragraph 7, have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.
4. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 3 and 14 over Ford in view of Schnegg and Boyd of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 7-10 Paragraph 8, have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.

Art Unit: 1772

5. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 15 over Ford in view of Schnegg and Keogh of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 13-14 Paragraph 11, has been withdrawn due to applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.

6. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 24 and 26-27 over Ford in view of Schnegg, Boyd, and Bettcher of record in the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 22-28 Paragraph 14, have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in the Paper filed January 18, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al (USPN 5,556,495) in view of Schnegg (USPN 5,191,777) and Woodall, Jr. (USPN 3,882,857). Note claims 4-5, 8, and 11-12 were rejected under this combination of references in the previous Office Action,

Art Unit: 1772

however, for clarification purposes the entire rejection will be repeated below.

Ford et al teach an abrasion resistant tubular sleeve formed from a fabric cloth that is heat set into a resilient tubular sleeve for protecting and/or covering elongate substrates such as cables, conduits or wiring (see abstract). Ford et al further teach that the fabric is preferably woven and spirally set in order to possess excellent flexibility and exceptional kink and abrasion resistance (col.2, 1.45-51) and is formed of polyamide or polyester (col.5, 1.10-22).

Ford et al fail to teach the fabric cloth being made by knitting the particular filaments claimed. However, Schnegg teaches forming a weft inserted, warp knit to substitute for woven fabrics because the weft inserted warp knit fabric described maintains the desirable characteristics and stability of woven fabrics while increasing the speed of production and the ability to use inferior yarn (col.2, 1.21-33). The preferred embodiment taught by Schnegg includes a monofilament yarn forming a first weft in a fabric cloth, a first multifilament yarn forming a second weft in said fabric cloth, a set of placed warps of third multifilament yarns forming a lay-in stitch lap (col.6, 1.59-66), and knitted warps of second multifilament yarns forming a chain stitch lap (col.7, 1.4-13).

Art Unit: 1772

The monofilament yarn is selected from the group consisting of polyester and polyamide (col.10, 1.9-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a weft inserted, warp knit is substituted for a woven fabric in order to provide the fabric with the same or similar physical properties and stability while being produced faster and with less expensive materials, as taught by Schnegg.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to substitute a weft inserted, warp knit as described in Schnegg for the woven fabric of Ford et al, in order to produce a fabric having the same or equivalent physical properties and stability as the woven fabric faster and with cheaper starting materials, as taught by Schnegg.

Ford et al and Schnegg taken as a whole teach all that is shown above and teach that the yarns are formed from polyamide or polyester. Ford et al and Schnegg fail to teach that the multifilament yarns are textured. However, Woodall teaches that yarns are textured or bulked in order to provide the fabric formed from the yarn with enhanced cushion. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the abrasion-resistant tubular sleeve of Ford et al and Schnegg is used to protect wires, cables, and/or conduits and that added

Art Unit: 1772

cushion and thickness of the tubular sleeve would add protection to the wires, cables, and/or conduits being covered.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to texture or bulk the multifilament yarns of Ford et al and Schnegg in order to provide the fabric with enhanced cushion, as taught by Woodall.

9. Claims 3, 6, 9, 13-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 8, and 12 above, and further in view of Boyd et al (US 2005/0017402 A1). Note claims 6, 9, 13, and 16-18 were rejected under this combination of references in the previous Office Action, however, for clarification purposes the entire rejection will be repeated below.

Regarding claims 3, 6, 9, and 13-14, Ford et al, Schnegg, and Woodall teach all that is claimed in claims 1-2, 5, 8, and 12 as shown above, but fail to teach that the multifilament yarn is formed of Nylon 6/6 having the claimed denier. The denier of the multifilament is not specifically taught in Boyd et al, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select the denier through routine experimentation

Art Unit: 1772

depending on the intended end result of the fabric, absent the showing of unexpected result. However, Boyd et al teach that Nylons and specifically Nylon 6/6 is well known for its toughness and abrasion resistance (p.5, paragraphs 41 and 42). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that Nylon 6/6 is a material that is well known in the art for having superior abrasion resistance, as taught by Boyd et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to select Nylon 6/6 as the material used to form the first weft in the fabric cloth of Ford et al and Schnegg, because Ford et al teaches an abrasion resistant tubular sleeve and Boyd et al teaches that is well known in the art that Nylon 6/6 has superior abrasion resistance.

Claims 16-17 teach all of the limitations taught in claims 3, 6, and 9 combined, which are all taught by Ford et al, Schnegg, Woodall, and Boyd et al as shown above.

Regarding claim 18, Boyd et al teach that it is well known in the art to form monofilament yarns having a Nylon 6/6 core or sheath and a polyester core or sheath respectively in order to form a filament that has improved properties over a single component monofilament. Nylon is specifically chosen because it has excellent abrasion resistance and toughness and the

Art Unit: 1772

polyester is added in order to provide the monofilament with greater dimensional stability (p.1, paragraph 8). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a monofilament yarn used in the formation of an abrasion-resistant fabric would include an inner core of Nylon 6/6 and an outer shell of polyester in order to provide the filament with excellent abrasion resistance without sacrificing dimensional stability, as taught by Boyd et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to form the monofilament of Ford et al, Schnegg, and Woodall, having an inner core of Nylon 6/6 and an outer shell of polyester, in order to form the monofilament having excellent abrasion resistance with enhanced dimensional stability compared to a single component Nylon 6/6 monofilament, as taught by Boyd et al.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Keogh (US 2002/0098357).

Ford, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. taken as a whole teach all that is claimed in claim 1, but fails to explicitly teach that the yarns are treated with a flame-retardant composition to

Art Unit: 1772

provide a self-extinguishing, no-burn-rate tubular sleeve. However, Keogh teaches that protective wraps for cables and wires are formed to be flame retardant because the wires and cables provide ready transport of flame unless the protective wraps are flame retardant (p.1, paragraph 3). Keogh teaches that materials such as PVC, PVDF, and FEP are conventionally used to provide flame retardance in protective wraps, but they are expensive and/or produce toxic and corrosive gases when exposed to flame (p.1, paragraphs 9-11). Therefore, Keogh teaches that other materials that are not inherently flame retardant are treated with a flame-retardant composition in order to provide a protective wrap that prevents flame spread and does not produce significant quantities of dense combustion smoke or toxic and corrosive combustion gases while still using inexpensive polymeric materials (p.2, paragraphs 13-18). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that tubular sleeves for protecting cords and wires are treated with flame-retardant compositions in order to provide the sleeve with flame retardance necessary to prevent flame spread along the length of the wires and cables without resorting to materials that are expensive and/or produce toxic and corrosive combustion smoke, as taught by Keogh.

Art Unit: 1772

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to treat the yarns of Ford, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. with a flame retardant composition in order to render the tubular sleeve flame retardant without using materials that are expensive or produce toxic and corrosive combustion smoke when exposed to a flame, as taught by Keogh.

11. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 19-20 over Ford, Schnegg, Woodall, Stanhope, and Keogh are repeated for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 14-18 Paragraph 12.

12. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 21-23 over Ford, Schnegg, Woodall, Stanhope, Keogh, and Boyd are repeated for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Pages 18-22 Paragraph 13.

13. Claims 24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al in view of Schnegg, Woodall, Jr., Boyd et al, and Bettcher et al (USPN 5,070,540).

Ford et al teach an abrasion resistant tubular sleeve formed from a fabric cloth that is heat set into a resilient

Art Unit: 1772

tubular sleeve for protecting and/or covering elongate substrates such as cables, conduits or wiring (see abstract). Ford et al further teach that the fabric is preferably woven and spirally set in order to possess excellent flexibility and exceptional kink and abrasion resistance (col.2, 1.45-51) and is formed of polyamide or polyester (col.5, 1.10-22).

Ford et al fail to teach the fabric cloth being made by knitting the particular filaments claimed. However, Schnegg teaches forming a weft inserted, warp knit to substitute for woven fabrics because the weft inserted warp knit fabric described maintains the desirable characteristics and stability of woven fabrics while increasing the speed of production and the ability to use inferior yarn (col.2, 1.21-33). The preferred embodiment taught by Schnegg includes a monofilament yarn forming a first weft in a fabric cloth, a first multifilament yarn forming a second weft in said fabric cloth, a set of placed warps of third multifilament yarns forming a lay-in stitch lap (col.6, 1.59-66), and knitted warps of second multifilament yarns forming a chain stitch lap (col.7, 1.4-13). The monofilament yarn is selected from the group consisting of polyester and polyamide (col.10, 1.9-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a weft inserted, warp knit is substituted for a woven fabric in order to provide the fabric

Art Unit: 1772

with the same or similar physical properties and stability while being produced faster and with less expensive materials, as taught by Schnegg.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to substitute a weft inserted, warp knit as described in Schnegg for the woven fabric of Ford et al, in order to produce a fabric having the same or equivalent physical properties and stability as the woven fabric faster and with cheaper starting materials, as taught by Schnegg.

Ford et al and Schnegg taken as a whole teach all that is shown above and teach that the yarns are formed from polyamide or polyester. Ford et al and Schnegg fail to teach that the multifilament yarns are textured. However, Woodall teaches that yarns are textured or bulked in order to provide the fabric formed from the yarn with enhanced cushion. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the abrasion-resistant tubular sleeve of Ford et al and Schnegg is used to protect wires, cables, and/or conduits and that added cushion and thickness of the tubular sleeve would add protection to the wires, cables, and/or conduits being covered.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to

Art Unit: 1772

texture or bulk the multifilament yarns of Ford et al and Schnegg in order to provide the fabric with enhanced cushion, as taught by Woodall.

Ford et al, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. taken as a whole teach all that is shown above and that the filaments have a diameter of from about 5 to about 15 mils (col.7 l.52-55 in Ford et al), but fail to explicitly teach that the monofilament yarn comprises Nylon 6/6. However, Boyd et al teach that Nylons and specifically Nylon 6/6 is well known for its toughness and abrasion resistance (p.5, paragraphs 41 and 42). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that Nylon 6/6 is a material that is well known in the art for having superior abrasion resistance, as taught by Boyd et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to select Nylon 6/6 as the material used to form the first weft in the fabric cloth of Ford et al and Schnegg, because Ford et al teaches an abrasion resistant tubular sleeve and Boyd et al teaches that is well known in the art that Nylon 6/6 has superior abrasion resistance.

Ford et al, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr. also fail to teach that the multifilament yarns are formed from stainless steel/polyester blends. However, Bettcher et al teach that

Art Unit: 1772

multifilament yarns made from blends of stainless steel and polyester render the fabric highly cut resistant, nonabsorbent while being light in weight, stretchable, and flexible (col.1, 1.53-63 and col.2, 1.33-36). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a stainless steel/polyester blend multifilament is used to form abrasion resistant fabrics in order to provide the fabric with not only abrasion resistance but also cut resistance and nonabsorbancy, as taught by Bettcher et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to select a stainless steel/polyester blend multifilament yarn as the multifilament yarn used in Ford et al and Schnegg, in order to provide in addition to the abrasion resistance, cut resistance, and nonabsorbent properties, as taught by Bettcher et al.

Regarding claim 26, Ford, Schnegg, Woodall, Jr., Boyd, and Bettcher et al taken as a whole teach all that is claimed in claim 24 and that the fabric further comprises a set of placed warps including a plurality of yarns forming a lay-in stitch lap as shown above. Ford, Schnegg, Woodall, Jr., and Bettcher et al fail to teach that the lay-in warp yarn is polyester over polyethylene terephthalate monofilament yarn. However, Boyd et

Art Unit: 1772

al teach that a monofilament is formed having a core of polyethylene terephthalate and a shell of polyester in order to improve certain physical characteristics such as abrasion resistance while maintaining other characteristics found in the ingredient employed without resorting to blends of more than one ingredient, which tend to not form strong bonds since they are not compatible in the same manner as two components of the same material (p.3, paragraph 21 and p.5, paragraph 38). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a monofilament of polyester over polyethylene terephthalate is substituted for monofilaments of polyester in order to improve certain physical characteristics such as abrasion resistance while maintaining other characteristics of the polyester without resorting to blends of incompatible materials, as taught by Boyd et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to substitute a monofilament of polyester over polyethylene terephthalate for the monofilament of polyester taught in Ford, Schnegg, and Woodall, Jr., in order to improve the abrasion resistance of the monofilament without resorting to blends with incompatible materials, as taught by Boyd et al.

Art Unit: 1772

Regarding claim 27, Boyd et al teach that it is well known in the art to form monofilament yarns having a Nylon 6/6 core or sheath and a polyester core or sheath respectively in order to form a filament that has improved properties over a single component monofilament. Nylon is specifically chosen because it has excellent abrasion resistance and toughness and the polyester is added in order to provide the monofilament with greater dimensional stability (p.1, paragraph 8). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a monofilament yarn used in the formation of an abrasion-resistant fabric would include an inner core of Nylon 6/6 and an outer shell of polyester in order to provide the filament with excellent abrasion resistance without sacrificing dimensional stability, as taught by Boyd et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to form the monofilament of Ford et al, Schnegg, and Woodall, having an inner core of Nylon 6/6 and an outer shell of polyester, in order to form the monofilament having excellent abrasion resistance with enhanced dimensional stability compared to a single component Nylon 6/6 monofilament, as taught by Boyd et al.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

14. Applicant's arguments regarding the objections to the specification and claims, and the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of record have been considered but they are moot since the rejections and objections have been withdrawn.

15. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 1-2 and 10 over Ford in view of Schnegg have been fully considered but are moot since the rejections have been withdrawn. However, with regards to how the arguments relate to the new rejections of claims 1-2 and 10, the arguments are not found persuasive for the reasons presented below.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion or motivation to substitute a weft inserted warp knit as described in Schnegg for the woven fabric of Ford, Schnegg explicitly teaches that the weft inserted warp knit as described in Schnegg is substituted for woven fabrics since maintain the characteristics of woven fabrics but may be produced with the production speed and lower cost of knitting (col.1, 1.21-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made that the weft inserted warp knit of Schnegg is substituted for the woven fabric of Ford since the knit of Schnegg maintains the

Art Unit: 1772

characteristics of the woven fabric but is produced faster and with less expense.

In response to Applicant's argument that Ford prefers fabric with spirally set filaments such as woven fabrics, although Ford does prefer woven fabrics because of their characteristics, Schnegg teaches that characteristics of woven fabrics are preserved when substituting the fabric of Schnegg for a woven fabric, and that the fabric is produced faster and cheaper.

16. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 4, 5, 8, 11, and 12 over Ford in view of Schnegg and Woodall have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Woodall, Jr. is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Woodall, Jr. is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant is concerned, since

Art Unit: 1772

Woodall, Jr. is concerned with forming a tubular sleeve that provides protection to an elongated body, in this case a orthopedic cast. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that tubular fabric sleeves for protection of elongated bodies would have similar structure and would look to any tubular fabric sleeve and not just sleeves specifically for protecting cables and wires. This is especially true in this case, in light of the fact that the claims are directed to a generic "tubular sleeve" and not specifically to cable and wire protecting sleeves.

17. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 6, 9, 13, and 16-18 over Ford in view of Schnegg, Woodall, and Boyd have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the Woodall reference with the other cited references, see the response to that argument above with regards to claims 4, 5, 8, 11, and 12.

18. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 24 and 26-27 over Ford in view of Schnegg, Boyd, and Bettcher especially with respect to claim 25 which

Art Unit: 1772

included Woodall have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the Woodall reference with the other cited references, see the response to that argument above with regards to claims 4, 5, 8, 11, and 12.

19. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 3, 14, 15, and 19-23 of record have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the Woodall reference with the other cited references, see the response to that argument above with regards to claims 4, 5, 8, 11, and 12.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this

Art Unit: 1772

action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P. Bruenjes whose telephone number is 571-272-1489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher P Bruenjes


Examiner

Art Unit 1772

CPB

CPB

February 23, 2006


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

1772

2/23/06